DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 095 HE 024 112

AUTHOR Cronin, Michael; Glenn, Phillip
TITLE Oral Communication across the Curriculum in Higher Education: Assessment, Recommendations and Implications for the Speech Communication Discipline.
PUB DATE Jun 90
NOTE 32p.; For a related paper, see HE 024 104.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; College Faculty; College Students; *Communication Skills; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; Curriculum Problems; Higher Education; Instructional Development; *Speech Communication; *Speech Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS *Oral Communication across the Curriculum; *Radford University VA

ABSTRACT

Oral communication across the curriculum programs initiated at universities and colleges are likely to experience several problems, including high costs and heavy workloads for faculty. An Oral Communication Program (OCP) designed to overcome potential problems was instituted at Radford University, Virginia. Results of the program's first year assessment suggest that OCPs, if appropriately planned and implemented can successfully and effectively enhance communication training in a cost-effective manner. Based on Radford's one year of operation and review of other OCPs the following recommendations are offered: (1) that quality control over communication-intensive courses should be provided; (2) that ongoing efforts should be maintained to secure funding from both public and private agencies because of high costs involved in the implementation of such programs; (3) that a clearinghouse for the sharing of instructional materials aimed at serving increased number of clients without increasing staff should be established; and (4) that evaluation and assessment of all major activities should be carried out. OCPs carry several implications for the Speech Communication discipline. If successful, they could create additional demand for speech communication courses as more students become interested in improving their communication skills; and they could also increase awareness of faculty, students, administrators, and funding agencies of the importance and academic credibility of Speech Communication. (Twenty-three references and 2 tables are appended.) (LT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. CS

ED327095

Oral Communication Across the Curriculum in Higher Education: Assessment, Recommendations and Implications for the Speech Communication Discipline

by

Michael Cronin, Ph.D.

Department of Communication

Radford University

Radford, VA 24142

703-831-5750 (O)

703-268-5726 (H)

and

Phillip Glenn, Ph.D.

Department of Speech Communication

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Carbondale, IL 62901

618-453-2291 (O)

618-684-6804 (H)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael Cronin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the June 1990 International Communication Association Convention, Dublin

HE 024 112

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Oral Communication Across the Curriculum in Higher Education: Assessment, Recommendations and Implications for the Speech Communication Discipline

Abstract

This article analyzes potential problems with oral communication across the curriculum programs in higher education, reviews published assessments of such programs, and reports activities and results from a faculty and student development program at a mid-sized comprehensive state university. The Oral Communication Program at Radford University promotes faculty development to facilitate the incorporation of oral communication activities across the curriculum. In addition to other training and development activities, instructors from across the university are invited to teach "communication-intensive" courses with consultation from a Speech faculty member. Results from the first year suggest that the Oral Communication Program holds significant promise for curricular development and improvement of student communication skills. Recommendations for the development of oral communication across the curriculum programs are provided as well as implications of such programs for the Speech Communication discipline.

In response to widespread calls for increased communication skills training for college students, several institutions have initiated programs in oral communication across the curriculum (see Weiss, 1988, for a review of start-up strategies for 8 different programs). This movement parallels the more established writing across the curriculum emphasis. Both emphases came out of the "language across the curriculum" movement that began in Great Britain in the 1960s (Parker, 1985).[1]

The rationale for an oral communication across the curriculum emphasis is discussed more fully elsewhere (Roberts, 1983; Roberts, 1984; Steinfatt, 1986; Hay, 1987; Cronin & Glenn, in editorial review). Briefly, it may be summarized as follows: Business and education leaders nationwide have noted in recent years that college graduates do not possess adequate communication skills. Communication skills, written and oral, are best developed if emphasized in a variety of courses. Except for students majoring in Communication, most undergraduates take <u>at most</u> one course emphasizing oral communication skills. Those students who take one oral communication course may have little or no opportunity for additional structured practice with competent evaluation to reinforce the skills learned in that course. Furthermore, although active oral communication represents a fundamental mode of learning (Modaff & Hopper, 1984), it often is underrepresented in lecture-oriented college

courses. Since "the act of creating and communicating a message is at the heart of the educational experience" (Steinfatt, 1986, p. 465), it is essential to improve the quality and expand the application of meaningful oral communication activities to enhance learning across the curriculum.

If designed and implemented appropriately, this strategy can provide students multiple opportunities to emphasize speaking and listening in a variety of content areas, with carefully designed assignments and constructive feedback. It can enhance learning in the classroom, as students take a more active role in mastering and communicating course content.

An oral communication across the curriculum emphasis in higher education poses several potential problems. For administrators facing scarce resources and difficult choices, it may seem an inexpensive alternative to adding basic speech courses (Palmerton, 1988). Faculty in other disciplines may assume too readily that they know how to teach speech with little or no assistance (Mix, 1987). Speaking and listening activities, if not handled properly, could provide little benefit to students and could even increase performance anxiety. This approach could entail a significant time demand on faculty in Speech Communication if their consulting services to colleagues in other disciplines are incorporated into the program. Such service may not meet the individual interests of the Communication faculty members, nor receive recognition in the university's reward

structure.

None of these potential dangers have been reported as actual problems in the on-going college or university programs of oral communication across the curriculum. Rather, a strong program can increase campus-wide recognition of the importance of the Communication Department. Administrators who are forward-looking enough to see the value of oral communication across the curriculum are not likely to reduce support for the basic speech course in the Communication Department. In fact, such programs tend to produce greater student demand for oral communication courses, thus providing a rationale for additional support in Speech (Roberts, 1983; Madsen, 1984).

Anecdotal evidence suggests that faculty in other disciplines who teach communication-intensive courses do not assume that they can teach speech with little or no training. Indeed, the opposite effect occurs as faculty working with communication consultants and participating in speech training gain increased appreciation for the complex variety of skills necessary to be an effective Speech instructor (Roberts, 1983).

The issue of improper training in speaking and listening skills can be a real problem if not handled properly. In recognition of this potential danger,most oral communication programs provide substantial in-service training in oral communication for faculty teaching communication-intensive courses. In addition to in-service training, the Radford Oral

Communication Program provides a Communication faculty member to work with each communication-intensive course instructor in planning, implementing and evaluating communication activities in that course. A partial index to the impact on students is seen in the fact that all reported student assessment of the value of communication experiences and training in such programs has been overwhelmingly positive (see Roberts, 1984; Palmerton, 1988; and the assessment portion of this article).

The final potential danger mentioned above, a drain on Speech Communication faculty without sufficient reward by the university, has not been identified as an actual problem in articles published to date. This issue would be most likely to arise at Radford and Clarkson which appear to be the only Oral Communication Programs that assign a Communication faculty member to work actively with each instructor of a communication-intensive course. Steinfatt (1986) at Clarkson has not reported on this issue. No Radford Communication faculty member has complained about <u>volunteering</u> his/her time (an average of 20 hours per semester) to help with this project; and all faculty members involved have volunteered to continue such service for 1989-90. The Radford administration has recognized such service as a significant university commitment in faculty evaluation for merit pay. Furthermore, funding is being sought from the state, with strong support from the administration, to provide reassigned time for Communication faculty serving as consultants

to communication-intensive courses.

If these potential dangers are anticipated and strategies devised to overcome those that prove to be real problems, an oral communication across the curriculum emphasis holds great potential for furthering communication training in a practical, cost-effective manner. Given this potential, it is important for pilot programs exploring these approaches to conduct careful assessment and evaluation of activities. We need to know: does oral communication across the curriculum enhance learning in the classroom? does it further students' oral communication skills? does communication training for faculty in other disciplines enable them to offer quality instruction in oral communication to their students? can Speech Communication faculty promote such a program without sacrificing other important interests?

The following section examines the published assessments of oral communication training across the curriculum at the college or university level. Following this review, a summary and assessment of the first year of operation of the OCP at Radford University will be presented.

DOES ORAL COMMUNICATION ACROSS THE CURRICULUM TRAINING WORK?

While many studies support the effectiveness of oral communication skills training in speech courses (see, for example Bassett & Boone, 1983; McCroskey & Richmond, 1980; Kelly, 1984; Steil, Barker & Watson, 1983; Wolvin, 1983), few studies have

focused on the effectiveness of a program of oral communication across the curriculum with regard to either skills training or enhancement of learning in higher education.

Although there are few such programs in existence at the college or university level and most of those are quite new, initial evaluations and assessments provide cause for optimism about the pedagogical value of this approach. The oldest communication across the curriculum program began at Central College, Iowa in the mid-1970s. Faculty were trained in summer workshops in four communication skills: reading, writing, speaking and listening. Speaking and writing centers were established for extracurricular assistance. Certain courses in the catalog were designated as emphasizing one of the four skills listed above.

A three-year study of one group of Central students indicates that 74% noticed a significant increase in their communication skills and attributed that increase to the skills program. Even more promising, 90% of the students indicated moderate or intense desire to continue improving their own skills (Roberts, 1983). It should be noted that this includes all four skill areas of reading, writing, speaking and listening. Roberts reports that Central faculty perceive clear benefits from the program: increased knowledge about communication skills, belief in the importance of teaching communication skills, confidence in teaching communication skills and a increase in the

"spirit of colleague-ship." Faculty who were trained in speaking at Central gave the same number of oral assignments as other instructors but were more likely to assist students in preparing speaking assignments.

Steinfatt describes a different approach in which communication modules are built into courses in the School of Management at Clarkson. In each case, a Speech Communication instructor works with the course instructor on designing, implementing and evaluating the communication activities. The modules go well beyond basic oral presentation and listening skills and include such topics as analysis of interpersonal communication in organizations and applied persuasion. In the absence of empirical data on outcomes, Steinfatt (1986) concludes:

> The Communication Program continues to grow and change at Clarkson. A complete evaluation of the program's effects will not be forthcoming for several years since it will be over a year before the first class to complete a full four years under the program graduates. As a preliminary assessment through objective evaluations of graduating seniors and MBA students, comments from visiting executives, and comments of supervisors of graduates, the program appears

> to be having a significant effect on the communication, and thus education, of Clarkson students. (p. 469)

St. Mary-of-the-Woods College in Indiana initiated a three-stage program including a speaking lab with video and audio recorders; a series of seminars to train faculty in communication theory, public speaking and listening; and the use of faculty trained in these seminars to conduct speech-emphasis courses across the curriculum. An interim evaluation of this program (Flint, 1986) revealed neither significant improvement in speaking skills nor significant reduction in communication apprehension. However, the sample size was deemed insufficient to warrant any definite conclusions. Furthermore, it is perhaps significant that St. Mary-of-the-Woods College has no existing major in Speech Communication.

At Hamline University, Minnesota, students must complete two "speaking-intensive" courses in areas other than Speech to graduate. More than 95% of students report that a speaking-intensive format helps them learn course content. Over 90% believe that their own oral communication skills and those of other students improved through participation in these courses. Forthcoming attempts to assess graduating seniors' skill levels to determine impact of speaking-intensive courses may provide the first strong empirical data addressing the effectiveness of this kind of instruction (Palmerton, 1988).

The initial reports are generally promising but more information is needed.[2] Do communication across the curriculum programs actually improve students' speaking and/or listening skills? Is the improvement long-lasting? Does such a program actually enhance learning in the classroom? What are the drawbacks? What features prove most valuable? With these questions in mind, but with confidence that this approach holds enormous potential, faculty and administrators at Radford University initiated the most ambitious oral communication across the curriculum program in the nation. A brief description of the program and results from its first year are detailed below. This article concludes with recommendations for others planning similar programs and implications of this approach for the Speech Communication discipline.

THE ORAL COMMUNICATION PROGRAM AT RADFORD UNIVERSITY

The State Council for Higher Education in Virginia awarded Radford University a Funds for Excellence Grant of $172,048 for 1988-1990 to develop an Oral Communication Program. Radford University provided an additional $240,355 in support of this project. The primary mission of the Oral Communication Program (OCP) is twofold:

1. To provide programming, facilities and professional expertise to help faculty, staff and students improve oral communication skills.

2. To support and facilitate the incorporation of oral communication as a learning activity into the undergraduate curriculum throughout Radford University, using the Writing Across the Curriculum program as a model.

To accomplish these objectives, Communication faculty established a center for assistance, developed instructional materials and provided expert assistance for university faculty, students and staff (see Cronin & Glenn, in editorial review, for a detailed description of the OCP).

Service Activities

Regular, ongoing service to the university community began in January, 1989. The service includes on-campus meetings, a newsletter, retreats, communication-intensive courses and individual assistance to students and faculty.

Approximately 40 faculty members (about 10 percent of the university total) attended one of two informational meetings held early in the fall, 1988 semester. At these meetings OCP personnel explained the program and outlined the range of ways to participate. First editions of the newsletter featured recent and upcoming OCP events, teaching tips and information about oral communication activities. In the spring semester, 15 faculty members attended a seminar on uses of debate as a teaching/learning tool in the classroom.

Thirteen select faculty from various schools and departments were invited to a weekend development retreat during the spring

semester. Four Speech faculty trained the participants in ways to design, implement and evaluate oral presentation assignments in the classroom. In addition, the retreat carried an experiential element as participants received basic instruction in public speaking and prepared, presented and evaluated a brief speech. Anonymous self-report evaluations from participants indicate the unanimous perception that the retreat provided them with an appreciation for the importance of oral communication, sensitivity to what students go through in preparing and delivering presentations, a sense of how to design such assignments to fit their own courses, knowledge of where to go for help with such assignments and a strong motivation to emphasize speaking in their classes. One sample comment summarizes these feelings:

> "I've gained a new appreciation for what students have to go through as they prepare and deliver a speech. I've also learned a great deal about what OCP has to offer, and I've committed myself to doing my best to encourage my students to take Speech classes. I'll also be utilizing speaking-intensive courses in the future."

Eleven faculty members from a variety of departments and colleges throughout the university taught communication-intensive courses with a total enrollment of over 400 students during the spring, 1989 semester.[3] Each communication-intensive course instructor was paired with a volunteer consultant from the

Speech faculty who assisted with planning, implementing and evaluating oral communication activities as part of the course. Although this required substantial time commitment by the faculty involved, it proved extremely successful. Evaluation results indicate that faculty and students perceived the activities as highly successful and valuable, both as a means of learning course content and as an opportunity for students to work on improving their oral communication skills.

In addition to these major service activities,several faculty, staff members and students requested OCP assistance with their own oral communication needs, ranging from delivering a conference paper to leading an organization. OCP staff also conducted systematic group desensitization of 31 highly communication apprehensive students during the spring, 1989 semester. Therapy groups met regularly to practice relaxation techniques and reduce anxieties related to public speaking.

Assessment of Spring, 1989 Communication-Intensive Courses[4]

Students (N = 369) from ten communication-intensive courses were surveyed at the end of the 1989 spring semester. They responded to a questionnaire eliciting their opinions on the effectiveness of oral communication activities incorporated into the class and indicated the type(s) of oral communication activities in which they participated.

Table 1 indicates the types of oral communication activities

used and the reported student participation in each of the activities. The communication-intensive courses incorporated lectures by Communication faculty, handouts, critiques of student performances and opportunities to work with Communication faculty on preparing oral communication assessments. Most students heard lectures by Communication faculty on oral communication skills (73.2%), participated in a group presentation(s) (70.7%), and/or received handouts on oral communication skills (59.3%).

Insert Table 1 about here

Enhancement of Communication Skills

Preliminary self-assessment data seems to support the value of communication-intensive courses in improving students' skills. Most students (60.7%) felt that the oral communication activities helped them improve their communication skills (see Table 2). Only 9.8% of respondents indicated that such activities did not enhance their oral communication skills.

Insert Table 2 about here

Enhancement of Learning Course Content

Most students (57.7%) felt that they would have learned less without the oral communication component of the course (see Table 2). Eight students (2.2%) indicated that they would have learned

more without the oral communication activities and 32% reported that they learned about the same.

While independent measures of actual student learning in communication-intensive courses are needed (such as control vs. experimental group studies), preliminary self-assessment data seem to support the value of communication-intensive courses in enhancing student learning of course content.

Overall Evaluation of Oral Communication Activities in Communication-Intensive Courses

Several survey items, while not directly assessing skill development or course learning, provide indirect evidence of the impact of OCP activities on both areas. When asked for their overall evaluation of the oral communication activities, 28.2% marked excellent and 51.8% marked good; less than 1% felt the activities were poor and no student felt the activities were very poor (see Table 2).

Most students (58.5%) liked participating in the oral communication activities; only 5.7% indicated that they disliked them (see Table 2).

Students appear to favor the incorporation of oral communication activities in communication-intensive courses (see Table 2). Most students (76.7%) felt that such activities should be used again in the course; while 3.5% indicated that oral communication activities should not be used again. Most students (69.7%) indicated that the course was better due to the inclusion

of oral communication activities; only 7.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this conclusion.

In summary, students appear to enjoy participating in oral communication activities and rate such activities as good or excellent. Students also feel that such activities should be included in courses and indicate that communication-intensive courses are better due to the inclusion of oral communication activities. Such responses have implications not only for student learning and skill development, but for related educational concerns such as student enjoyment of courses, course and instructor evaluations, student motivation, etc.

DISCUSSION

With its Oral Communication Program, Radford University joins the small group of institutions emphasizing oral communication training across the curriculum. This approach holds considerable promise for furthering communication skills training which is well-integrated with course content in various fields. There are several potential drawbacks, and the newness of this approach dictates that pioneering programs provide thorough description and evaluation of activities. The Radford Oral Communication Program is designed to overcome potential drawbacks by:

1. Obtaining sufficient funding to cover reassigned time, lab facilities and other expenses so that present resources are not unduly drained;

2. Maintaining careful quality control over activities conducted under the auspices of the program, particularly in communication-intensive courses taught by instructors in other disciplines; and

3. Designing thorough and ongoing assessment of all major activities.

The Radford OCP has achieved considerable success in its first year. Self-report data indicate that faculty members appreciate the assistance available and understand its value. Students recognize the need for oral communication across the curriculum and perceive positive benefits in terms of their skill development, mastery of course content and enjoyment of the course. In recognition of the need for more objective and long-term measurements of impact, a range of assessment activities are in progress at Radford, including quasi-experimental designs between multiple sections of the same course and instructor, comparing those with a communication-intensive focus to those without it.

There are presently approximately ten such college or university programs upon which direct experience-based recommendations many may be drawn (many valuable insights for OCP development may be gained from studying analogous features of Writing Across the Curriculum Programs). Weiss (1988) offers four recommendations: 1) Promote the program on the basis of growth opportunities for all students rather than remediation for

those with serious deficiencies; 2) Avoid mere lip service by promoting a significant oral communication component in communication-intensive courses; 3) Take account of constructive criticism of "enemies" of the program but go ahead with the program.

Weiss' fourth recommendation is that "the program must retain its contacts across the university community rather than become the sinecure of one department or administrative group" (1988, p. 13). The authors agree that contact and support across the university community help spread a sense of commitment to the program; however, there are some advantages to keeping primary responsibility within one department or administrative group. The pride, ego-involvement and dedication to such programs when housed in a Communication Department may be necessary to ensure its continued success. If Communication faculty are to continue to make major contributions to the program, especially in consulting for communication-intensive courses, it may be necessary to have a strong departmental identification with the program. Failing this, other Communication Department priorities may erode the active involvement of sufficient department faculty to help apply oral communication to learn across the curriculum. Furthermore, if programs of this type are subject to being "lopped off" (Weiss, 1988, p. 14) when they become too vulnerable, the deciding factors are not whether they are the sinecure of one department

but rather their proven success and their university-wide support.

Based on Radford's one year of operation and review of other OCPs, the authors offer the following additional recommendations:

1. Provide reassigned time for Communication faculty serving as program coordinators and as consultants to communication-intensive courses. Reliance on voluntary service cannot ensure program stability over a number of years.

2. Develop and establish a clearing house to share self-paced instructional materials in order to serve increased numbers of clients without major expansions in staff.

3. Conduct major persuasive efforts on a continuing basis to obtain and maintain support for the program from Communication faculty, faculty university-wide and the administration.

4. Provide careful assessment of all major activities. While such measures as faculty and student opinion regarding the value of the OCP are necessary, additional evaluative measures should attempt independent assessment of skills improvement. Empirical measures of both immediate and long-term effects of such programs are essential. Assessment must address the key claims that oral communication across the curriculum helps students learn as well as measuring the enhancement of communication skills through an OCP.

5. Provide quality control over communication-intensive courses. Requiring detailed proposals from communication-

intensive course instructors helps ensure adequate communication emphasis. Following the screening of applications, the OCP staff must carefully match consultants with communication-intensive course instructors, taking into consideration areas of expertise needed and individual communication styles. The communication consultant and the course instructor should meet to enable a detailed discussion of the oral communication aspects of the course. These meetings, at Radford, often result in additional oral communication activities being incorporated into the course and a refinement of communication activities planned as well as improved evaluation procedures for oral communication activities.

6. Maintain ongoing efforts to secure funding from both public and private agencies. Roberts argues that grant support "is not a necessity for the success of similar ventures at other institutions" (1983, p. 56). The authors strongly disagree with this position. Quality programs of this type require substantial funding which the institution is not likely to have available. Costs may run high for facilities, workshops, retreats, consultants, additional equipment, reassigned time for faculty and development and purchase of instructional materials. The fact that all institutions with oral communication across the curriculum programs have received "substantial assistance" (Weiss, 1988, p. 5) from grants reinforces this point (it should

be noted that Clarkson, the one institution that did not receive a grant for an oral communication program, received grants from G.M. and A.T. & T. for projects related to the program). The authors suggest working closely with the institutional grants office (if available) to prepare and target such requests for support (see Cronin & Glenn, in editorial review, for an example of a grant proposal that secured over $172,000 for the 1988-1990 biennium).

The oral communication across the curriculum movement carries several implications for the Speech Communication discipline. First, and most important, if such programs achieve their stated objectives, this approach may provide real and lasting benefits to students, both in oral communication skills improvement and in mastery of course content in various areas. The Speech Communication discipline can play a major role in fostering such outcomes throughout the university and in promoting the continued oral communication education of students after they leave Speech classes. Whatever their drawbacks, if oral communication programs can help achieve this, they will hold some value. However, such learning outcomes remain difficult to demonstrate empirically, and harder still to link causally to one intervention such as revamping a course outside the discipline to include more oral communication emphasis.

Second, successful oral communication programs may create additional demand for Speech Communication courses, as students

in other disciplines become intrigued by the study of human communication. In some colleges and universities high demand is a "good" problem, possibly leading to increased funding for faculty positions, classroom space, equipment, etc. However, in situations where additional resources are not provided, increased demand may be the last problem Speech Communication faculty wish to confront. In short, oral communication programs may provide a means for enhancement of departmental resources, alternatively, they can prove a drain on already-limited resources if not planned and controlled carefully.

Third, oral communication programs offer new opportunities for Speech faculty--in service to colleagues, in consulting with other professional or educational audiences, in development of new teaching tools and in related research. Yet, such programs clearly require investment of time and energies in primarily a service capacity. This increased service commitment may not meet the individual interests of many Speech faculty members and may not be sufficiently rewarded in the tenure and promotion structure of some colleges and universities.

Finally, oral communication across the curriculum programs help students, faculty in other disciplines, administrators and funding agents become more aware of the value and academic credibility of the Speech Communication discipline as they undergo direct training or observe the importance of oral communication activities for skills improvement and learning.

Credibility-enhancement may prove valuable given the relatively late emergence of Speech Communication as a separate academic field. However, this credibility may develop based on the perception that Speech Communication is primarily about improvement of speaking and listening skills. At its worst, this perception could contribute to old and dangerous stereotypes about our field being content-less, offering performance skills that can be applied to areas having a body of knowledge. Clearly, speaking and listening skills improvement is central to what we do; but it is not all we do, and we must educate people outside the discipline about the range of teaching and research interests pursued within departments of Speech Communication. Programs in oral communication across the curriculum may provide forums for initiating dialogue with others about these issues.

NOTES

[1] Attempts to integrate skills with content knowledge have played a part in educational reform through much of this century (Russell, 1988).

[2] No published assessment is available to date for oral communication across the curriculum programs at Depauw University and Pima Community College. Ithaca College (Erlich & Kennedy, 1982) and Alverno College (Mentkowski & Doherty, 1984) have conducted evaluations but report no specific assessments of the oral communication component.

[3] Seventeen instructors have been selected to conduct communication-intensive courses for fall, 1989. This represents an increase of over fifty percent from the spring, 1989 pilot semester.

[4] Dr. Steven M. Culver, Radford University Director of Student Assessment Programs, conducted the survey and prepared the tables.

REFERENCES

Bassett, R. E., & Boone, M. E. (1983). Improving speech communication skills: An overview of the literature. In R. B. Rubin (Ed.) Improving speaking and listening skills (pp. 83-93). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Braithwaite, D. (1988, November). Anyone can teach Speech, right? The impact of speaking across the curriculum on the discipline. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, New Orleans.

Combs, H. W., & Bourne, G. (1989). The impact of marketing debates on oral communication skills. The Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication, 52, 21-25.

Cronin, M. & Glenn, P. (In editorial review). The oral communication program at Radford University: A communication across the curriculum emphasis.

Curtis, D., Winsor, J., & Stephens, R. (1989). National preferences in business and communication education. Communication Education, 38, 6-14.

Erlich, H., & Kennedy, M. (1982). Skills and content: Coordinating the classroom. Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education, 6 (3), 24-27.

Flint, L. (1986, April). An interim measure of the effectiveness of a speech emphasis curriculum. Paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, Cincinnati.

Hay, E. (1987 November). Communication across the curriculum. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Boston.

Kelly, L. (1984). Social skills training as a mode of treatment for social communication problems. In J. Daly and J. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence and communication apprehension (pp. 189-208). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Madsen, J. (1984, April). Respect from other disciplines: A case study in program development. Paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, Chicago.

McCroskey, J., & Richmond, V. (1980). The quiet ones: Communication apprehension and shyness. Dubuque, IA: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Mentkowski, M., & Doherty, A. (1984, February). Abilities that last a lifetime: Outcomes of the Alverno experience. AAHE Bulletin, 36, 5-6, 11-14.

Mix, C.R. (1987, November). But can they teach speech? Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Boston.

Modaff, J., & Hopper, R. (1984). Why speech is "basic". Communication Education, 33, 37-42.

Palmerton, P. R. (1988, November). Speaking across the curriculum: Threat, opportunity, or both? Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, New Orleans.

Parker, R. (1985, May). The "language across the curriculum" movement: A brief overview and bibliography. College Composition and Communication, 36, 173-177.

Roberts, C. V. (1984, November). A report of a three year program in teaching communication skills across the curriculum. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago.

Roberts, C. V. (1983). Speaking and listening education across the curriculum. In R. B. Rubin (Ed.) Improving speaking and listening skills (pp. 47-58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Russell, D. R. (1988, November). The language across the curriculum movements in historical perspective: Toward a social interpretation. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, New Orleans.

Steil, L. K., Barker, L. L., & Watson, K. W. (1983). Effective listening: Key to your success. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Steinfatt, T. (1986). Communication across the curriculum. Communication Quarterly, 34, 460-470.

Weiss, R. O. (1988, November). Start-up strategies for speaking and listening across disciplines. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, New Orleans.

Wolvin, A. D. (1983). Improving listening skills. In R. B. Rubin (Ed.), Improving speaking and listening skills (pp. 13-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

TABLE 1
ORAL COMMINICATION PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Heard lecture(s) on oral communication skills.

PARTICIPATED	270	73.2
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	99	26.8

Received handout(s) on oral communication skills.

PARTICIPATED	219	59.3
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	150	40.7

Participated in a group presentation(s).

PARTICIPATED	261	70.7
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	108	29.3

Made individual oral presentation(s).

PARTICIPATED	139	37.7
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	230	62.3

Participated in debate(s).

PARTICIPATED	92	24.9
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	277	75.1

Participated in interviews or conferences.

PARTICIPATED	63	17.1
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	306	82.9

Met outside of class with a Communication faculty member to work on oral communication skills.

PARTICIPATED	61	16.5
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	308	83.5

Viewed audio- or video-tapes of my communication activities.

PARTICIPATED	160	43.4
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	209	56.6

Received evaluation of my communication performance from a Communication faculty member.

PARTICIPATED	143	38.8
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	226	61.2

Helped evaluate my peers on their communication performance.

PARTICIPATED	143	38.8
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	226	61.2
Other		
PARTICIPATED	18	4.9
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	351	95.1

TABLE 2
ORAL COMMUNICATION PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

	NO.	%
Overall evaluation of oral communication activities.		
EXCELLENT	104	28.2
GOOD	191	51.8
FAIR	45	12.2
POOR	3	.8
VERY POOR	0	0
NO ANSWER	26	7.0
Without oral communication activities I would have		
LEARNED MORE	8	2.2
LEARNED ABOUT THE SAME	118	32.0
LEARNED LESS	213	57.7
NO ANSWER	30	8.1
Oral communication should not be used again this course.		
STRONGLY AGREE	6	1.6
AGREE	7	1.9
NEUTRAL	46	12.5
DISAGREE	149	40.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	134	36.3
NO ANSWER	27	7.3
Oral communication activities have helped me improve my communication skills.		
STRONGLY AGREE	59	16.0
AGREE	165	44.7
NEUTRAL	82	22.2
DISAGREE	32	8.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	1.1
NO ANSWER	27	7.3
Feelings on participation in oral communication activities.		
LIKED	216	58.5
NEUTRAL	105	28.5
DISLIKED	21	5.7
NO ANSWER	27	7.3

Course is better due to the inclusion of oral communication activities.

STRONGLY AGREE	77	20.9
AGREE	180	48.8
NEUTRAL	57	15.4
DISAGREE	23	6.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6	1.6
NO ANSWER	26	7.0